UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
Friday, 15 November 1991
at 4 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. MROZIEWICZ	(Poland)
later:	Mr. ALPMAN (Vice-Chairman)	(Turkey)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and Action on draft resolutions under disarmament agenda items (continued)
- Statement by the Chairman
- Programme of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-61780 7402V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.37
26 November 1991

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4.50 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 56 TO 63 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, in cluster 3.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should first like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1: Albania, Guinea, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Senegal and the United States;

A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1: Guinea, Italy, Panama, and Papua New Guinea.

As far as draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 is concerned, it was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are also members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Mauritania and Tunisia advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RIDER (New Zealand): New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

As we stated in the general debate, the recent unilateral measures announced by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom are nothing less than a revolution in the way disarmament is approached. It is clear to us that these measures constitute significant reductions in nuclear weapons. They are also important in so far as they are tangible evidence of a more cooperative approach to arms control.

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

This is already being reflected in negotiations on a range of disarmament issues, and we hope it will continue to play a major part in the enhancement of security.

The recently announced unilateral measures following the signature of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) in July 1991 have received widespread support and admiration. New Zealand believes it is important that this support should be reflected also at the United Nations, where support for disarmament, and nuclear disarmament in particular, is strong.

We appreciate the efforts that have been made by the delegations of Yugoslavia and the United Kingdom to produce a text that would receive an overwhelming level of support. We are disappointed, however, that their work could not proceed to a point where consensus was possible. New Zealand would encourage further consideration of the issue with a view to reaching improved agreement on this subject in the near future.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

My delegation is deeply dismayed at the outcome of the negotiations on this draft resolution. This year, 1991, has seen the following developments in United States-Soviet Union arms-control and disarmament efforts: the complete elimination of intermediate-range nuclear missiles; the signing of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START); the unilateral decision by the United States to withdraw ground-based nuclear weapons from deployment overseas; the unilateral decision by the United States to remove nuclear weapons from its surface navy and naval aircraft; several reciprocal decisions

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

by the Government of the USSR; and decisions by both of our countries to increase stragetic stability by decreasing the level of readiness of elements of our intercontinental nuclear forces.

It is simply incomprehensible that the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly cannot produce a consensus draft resolution taking note of these remarkable achievements. We are aware that improvements have been made in the draft resolution in the course of negotiations during the past weeks. We thank the large number of Governments that have expressed appreciation and support for the steps we have taken to reduce nuclear arsenals. But we cannot join a consensus on a draft resolution that goes back to the stale rhetoric of a past era, that condemns equally by implication all nuclear-weapon States as threats to the rest of the world, and that distorts United States-Soviet statements in order to promote immediate further steps that the parties know the United States cannot accept.

A handful of delegations has prevented the First Committee from acknowledging unanimously the dramatic progress in nuclear-weapons reductions achieved this year. I fear that this may raise questions in the minds of many about the relevance of this Committee to the events in the real world.

Mr. COTTAFAVI (Italy): In explaining Italy's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States, I wish to recall that the Italian delegation, in the statement delivered in this Committee on 7 November 1991, expressed its strong conviction that a more factual and cooperative approach, focused on positive developments more than on divergent views, could have allowed this Committee to reach a common position and to

(Mr. Cottafavi, Italy)

express joint support for the extraordinary progress achieved, or foreseen, in bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. The adoption this year of a draft resolution by consensus could have given a timely signal of the international community's firm commitment to pursue continued progress in bilateral and multilateral forums towards the goal of nuclear disarmament.

Regrettably, the basis for a consensus vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 was not found, although most of the elements of that text seem to correspond to an approach more in line with the changing times and with improving prospects for achieving further reductions in nuclear arsenals world-wide.

The Italian delegation hopes, therefore, that the new positive developments in the negotiations and the significant evolution in the position of more delegations will allow this Committee next year finally to express a common positive evaluation on a subject of such vital importance for the international community.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

The delegation of the United Kingdom deplores the fact that the international community has not been able to welcome by consensus the momentous bilateral achievements of the United States and the USSR over the past 12 months. It seems very strange that a draft resolution commending the actions of two Member States should be framed in a form which one of them cannot accept.

The United Kingdom particularly welcomes President Bush's nuclear initiative and President Gorbachev's positive and encouraging response. For

(Mr. Taylor, United Kingdom)

its part, the United Kingdom has taken comparable unilateral steps to reduce the numbers and deployments of its tactical nuclear weapons, and I am sure delegations will want to welcome the 80 per cent reduction in sub-strategic nuclear weapons recently announced by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The reductions in nuclear deployments world-wide which are now in prospect promise a period of greatly enhanced stability.

There are unfortunately, however, points in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 which do not represent the United Kingdom's viewpoint. In particular, we do not accept the implication in the sixth preambular paragraph that our nuclear weapons threaten the world.

While we recognize our commitment to general and complete disarmament, for the foreseeable future strategic stability is predicated on the existence of nuclear weapons. We have always made it clear with regard to the United Kingdom's possession of nuclear weapons that their role in NATO is solely defensive.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should point out that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 has programme budget implications, which are set out in document A/C.1/46/L.47. It was submitted on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States and on behalf of those that are members of the Latin American and Caribbean States. In addition, the sponsors are the following: Bangladesh, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, India, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 4 was retained by by 107 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 as a whole was adopted by 131 votes to 1.*

The CHAIRMAN: I call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States was pleased to join in adopting by consensus last year's resolution (45/59 E) regarding United Nations Regional Centres for disarmament, which provided for the Centres' operation without adverse implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. This year, however, we voted against draft resolution

---

* Subsequently the delegation of Latvia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

A/C.1/46/L.14, because it provides for funding of the Centres' administrative costs from the Organization's regular budget and specifically, we understand, from the United Nations Contingency Fund. The United States opposes the inclusion of this item in the regular budget, and particularly within the coverage of the Contingency Fund, which is essential to the Organization's ability to respond quickly and effectively to unanticipated developments. We are concerned that the flexibility and responsiveness of the United Nations will be dangerously and unnecessarily handicapped by tapping the fund excessively for non-emergency purposes. In any case, given the overall pressures on the United Nations regular budget and Contingency Fund, the United States view is that the Centres should continue to be funded from voluntary contributions as provided for at the time the Centres were established.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, which refers to the three United Nations Regional Centres for peace and disarmament. The United Kingdom fully supports the valuable work carried out by the three Centres. Indeed, the head of the United Kingdom delegation here attended the workshop in Mexico City in July, organized under the auspices of the Latin American and Caribbean Centre, and he was able to see firsthand the value of the operation.

(Mr. Taylor, United Kingdom)

That workshop was generously funded by the Government of Norway, and it is the United Kingdom's understanding that when the centres were opened the intention was that they should operate essentially on the basis of voluntary funding. Two years ago, the General Assembly decided through its resolution 44/117 F to accept into the regular budget the costs of providing a full-time director for each of the centres. The budgetary handling of that decision was such that my delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote on that resolution.

During the First Committee's consideration of the draft resolution which became 44/117 F, we were assured that the costs associated with these director posts were all that was proposed in the way of support from the regular budget for the three centres. Now we are faced with additional administrative costs as a regular call on the United Nations budget at a rate of $600,000 for the next biennium.

My delegation is unable to support this additional call for funds, and it is for this reason that we voted as we did.

Mr. NOREEN (Sweden): On behalf of the five Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and my own country, Sweden - I wish to explai.. our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 on the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament.

The Nordic countries fully support the regional centres and their objectives and would like to see them play a more active role in the future in efforts to promote peace, disarmament and security in their respective regions. We therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14.

The Nordic countries did, however, abstain in the separate vote on paragraph 4, which contains a decision to cover the administrative costs of the centres from the regular budget. We fully understand the motive of

(Mr. Noreen, Sweden)

ensuring continued financial viability of the regional centres and are not per se opposed to financing the centres from the regular budget. In fact, the Nordic countries have in other cases supported proposals by the Secretary-General to change the way of financing from voluntary contributions to allocations over the regular budget. But for reasons of principle, it is important that such changes be initiated by the Secretary-General and undergo the scrutiny and priority discussion that are provided in the regular budgetary process.

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to state briefly why my delegation requested a separate vote on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 and why we abstained in the vote on it.

We wish to recall that from the very beginning of the emergence of the idea of setting up regional centres for peace and disarmament in various parts of the world, it was emphasized that their work would be carried out strictly on a voluntary financial basis; and initially that was the case. Now attempts have been made to introduce radical changes, in other words, to secure financing of the administrative costs of the centres from the regular budget. A considerable sum is involved in this matter: $600,000. We cannot agree to this approach. Therefore, for reasons of principle and in the light of the practical consequences of the adoption of such a decision, we abstained in the vote on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14.

Ms. MASON (Canada): Canada would like to associate itself fully with the explanation of vote in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 made by Sweden on behalf of the five Nordic countries.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 and L.23/Rev.1, listed in cluster 7.

I now call on the representative of the Netherlands, who will introduce draft resolution L.18/Rev.1.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Since some concerns had yet to be met with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 and because of the vital importance of the highly relevant project embodied in it, the sponsors have decided to introduce a final revision in order to ensure that it has the broadest possible support.

I shall now read out the new texts of paragraphs 7, 8, 10, 11 and 13:

"7. Requests the Secretary-General to establish and maintain at United Nations Headquarters in New York a universal and non-discriminatory Register of Conventional Arms, to include data on international arms transfers as well as information provided by Member States on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies as set out in paragraph 10, in accordance with procedures and input requirements initially comprising those set out in the annex to the present resolution and subsequently incorporating any adjustments to the annex decided upon by the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session in the light of the recommendations of the panel referred to in paragraph 8;".

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

"8. Also requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts to be nominated by him on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to elaborate the technical procedures, to make any adjustments to the annex necessary for the effective operation of the Register and to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data of military holdings and procurement through national production, and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session;

"10. Invites Member States, pending the expansion of the Register, also to provide to the Secretary-General, with their annual report on imports and exports of arms, available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies; and requests the Secretary-General to record this material and to make it available for consultation by Member States at their request;

"11. Decides with a view to future expansion to keep the scope of and the participation in the Register under review and, to this end:

(a) Invites Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views, not later than 30 April 1994, on:

(i) The operation of the Register during its first two years;

(ii) The addition of further categories of equipment and the elaboration of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production;

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

(b) Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts convened in 1994 on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament as set forth in paragraphs 12 to 15 below and the views expressed by Member States for submission to the General Assembly with a view to a decision at its forty-ninth session;

"13. Further requests the Conference on Disarmament to address the problems of, and the elaboration of practical means to increase, openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction in accordance with existing legal instruments;".

It is the hope of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as now orally amended, that it will be adopted with the widest support possible.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of vote.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): In light of the statement we have just heard from the representative of the Netherlands, my delegation would like to inform the Committee that it does not insist on action being taken on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/46/L.48, submitted by Egypt.

Mr. MANRIQUE (Venezuela)(interpretation from Spanish): We have asked to speak at this stage in order to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1.

(Mr. Manrique, Venezuela)

The draft resolution on the subject of international arms transfers - "Transparency in armaments" - gave rise to a general exchange of ideas and positions, and the final result was the text that is now before the Committee.

The draft resolution contains the fundamental elements to make it possible to initiate a process of control and transparency in international arms transfers. In our opinion, this is one part of the machinery which should generate a climate of confidence contributing to a reduction in the military expenditure of the developing countries that in the 10 years from 1978 to 1988 rose to the astronomical figure of $371 billion.

This is a compromise text resulting from intensive negotiations, and some ideas and concepts are still rather imprecisely expressed. Even so, we are convinced that it represents an important step forward towards securing stricter control on arms transfers and their production, stockpiling and sale. We have no doubt that this draft resolution is the beginning of a long march in the right direction. But we realize that it is precisely that: the beginning of a process of control, not the end of that process which must embrace production and the transfer of technology as crucial elements. It was for these reasons that we decided to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

We were particularly pleased to hear the statement by the representative of the Netherlands when he introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, when he said that as a result of the negotiations there had emerged a consensus that the international community had a clear responsibility in the face of the excessive and destabilizing process represented by the build-up of conventional armaments.

(Mr. Manrique, Venezuela)

We were also pleased that the representative of the Netherlands stated that all the sponsors recognized that this matter had many facets, such as the interrelationship between the transfer, production and stockpiling of arms, without forgetting the relationship between transparency in conventional armaments and advanced technology with military applications.

(Mr. Manrique, Venezuela)

In conclusion I should like to stress that we cannot miss the opportunity to call attention to the excessive accumulation of conventional weapons, which has sapped the budgets of our countries. This substantially undermines the real security of our societies, as represented by our people's quality of life.

Mr. RIDER (New Zealand): In their joint statement to the Committee on 5 November 1991, Australia and New Zealand expressed their wish to see the recommendations of the experts study group on arms transfers adopted and implemented without delay.

Our two Governments are pleased with the development of the text which is now before us as draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 with the oral amendments just introduced by my neighbour the Ambassador of the Netherlands. We believe the text provides a sound basis for the establishment of such a register. We offer our thanks to all those responsible for its negotiation.

New Zealand and Australia are pleased to be among the sponsors of the draft resolution. We commend it to all members of the Committee and we look forward to participating in the follow-up action and elaboration of the arms-transfer register.

Mr. DUNAY (Hungary): We have heard a number of delegations speak about one of the most important and perhaps most comprehensive draft resolutions, the one dealing with the issue of transparency in armaments. The establishment of an international arms-transfer register under the auspices of the United Nations and the functioning of such a register would be, beyond any doubt, of universal benefit and could exercise a positive influence on the security policy of each Member State.

As has been said so many times, one of the greatest concerns today is the proliferation and excessive accumulation of conventional weapons. If that is

(Mr. Dunay, Hungary)

to be prevented, we first have to achieve greater transparency in arms transfers.

During the cold war, under the unnecessary rules of secrecy prevailing at the time, we had very little or incomplete information on the weapons that have been the subject matter of our disarmament negotiations. The first important breakthrough in this respect was achieved in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, whose rules on exchange of information embrace five major categories of conventional armaments and equipment.

Taking all this into consideration, we can easily imagine the importance of an international register that could create transparency and openness in arms transfers, making them transparent all over the world and providing each Member State with the opportunity to display its openness. In our view such an unprecedented instrument under the auspices of the United Nations could serve as a catalyst for other confidence-building measures and could make it possible for each Member State to evaluate its security situation and assess its military capabilities as compared to those of any other State in the region or anywhere else in the world. This overall transparency would certainly promote mutual understanding, encourage real voluntary restraint by States in their arms transfers, help dispel suspicion and misunderstandings and reduce tensions and hostilities, which have been partially due to the lack of information about the military capabilities of others.

Along the same lines, we are also glad to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1, dealing with the specific category of international arms transfers. The Government of Hungary has paid particular attention to the goal expressed in the preamble of the draft resolution: to contribute to the prevention of the escalation of tension in general and in a regional context in particular. It is in that light that

(Mr. Dunay, Hungary)

appropriate laws have been adopted in Hungary and the relevant administrative machinery is being developed to fulfil the goal expressed in detail in operative paragraph 4.

The delegation of Hungary is satisfied with the scope of the register of conventional arms since it covers the most important categories of offensive weapons. It is our understanding - and we support this step - that at an early date the register will be further developed to take account of holdings, national production and other categories of armaments besides exports and imports, since otherwise it would discriminate between countries having large arms industries and those relying on imported weapons.

We deem it necessary that both arms exports and imports be registered since this makes circumvention difficult by requiring coordination of efforts of the exporting and the recipient States.

In our view, for the register to be really established and transparency to prevail it is necessary that the procedure for setting it up and the initial objectives should be realistic and stay within the limits of feasibility. At the same time, great attention should be paid to adherence to the register; States' restraint in their arms exports and imports should be voluntary; and transparency should be tailored to national, regional and international interests.

In my long list, I have mentioned only those requirements that we find indispensable for the realization of our objectives, but I am convinced that they sufficiently demonstrate that the task we are undertaking is a very complicated one and it cannot be carried out overnight. Nevertheless, that should not prevent us in any way from taking the first steps for the

(Mr. Dunay, Hungary)

establishment of the register now, or from progressively continuing our steps towards a completed, effectively functioning register.

In conclusion, one cannot fail to commend with appreciation the valuable contribution made by those delegations that raised this important issue and embarked on drawing up the relevant draft resolution. Our appreciation should go equally to all those who devoted so much time and energy to attaining the final draft that we are about to adopt.

Mr. ALPMAN (Turkey): Turkey has traditionally supported the concept of transparency in military matters, which it considers an important component of efforts aimed at building confidence and reducing unpredictability among States in a regional as well as a universal framework. We supported from the outset the establishment of a standardized United Nations annual reporting system on military budgets and participated in its implementation. Consequently, Turkey cannot but welcome the creation of a United Nations register for transparency in armaments.

As my delegation emphasized in its statement on 30 October 1991 in the general debate of the First Committee, we are of the view that the scope of the register should be widened so as to include the production of armaments. It is our belief that such a comprehensive register would enhance transparency and have an increased confidence-building potential. Throughout the consultations that took place amongst members of the First Committee on this issue, we supported efforts aimed at the incorporation of appropriate language in the text of the relevant draft resolution with regard to the inclusion of production figures in the register.

(Mr. Alpman, Turkey)

We consider that the new text contained in document A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 responds more directly to our expectations and constitutes a commendable effort on behalf of the initial sponsors of the draft resolution. Therefore, Turkey has decided to join the sponsors of the draft resolution with a view to encouraging the early addition to the register of data on production of armaments. The oral amendments just introduced by the representative of the Netherlands constitute a further positive step in this direction.

Mr. RIVERO del ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Before we take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended, I wish to explain our position and the motivation for that position.

It is evident to all delegations that from the start of the substantive work of the Committee in mid-October we have been working on the basic ideas initiated by a group of countries consisting in this instance of the European Economic Community (EEC) and Japan. The draft resolution now before us differs in content and implications from many others that the First Committee has seen at this session and past sessions. There are thus no considerations involved here about the work of any deliberative, collegial or negotiating body, nor about the contents, priority or characteristics which must be associated with the discussion or treatment of any particular subject. In either of the first two cases, our Committee would have had two texts instead of one; in the others, a decision would have been taken by vote without the full agreement of all delegations - despite the emphasis that has repeatedly and insistently been laid on the need for consensus in order to guarantee progress in disarmament.

Now we have before us a new United Nations mechanism that is closely connected with the national security of many countries that do not produce arms themselves and which, like mine, depend upon imported arms for their defence; hence the importance we attach to the subject and the care we need to exercise in reaching a conclusion and assuming the commitments it entails.

From an analysis of document A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as amended this afternoon, one conclusion stands out, in our judgement. We are about to put into effect a decision to set up a registry of conventional arms for which States would be required to supply statistics relating to a very special

(Mr. Rivero del Rosario, Cuba)

field, that is, their transfers of conventional arms through exports or imports.

On the other hand, there are promises to expand the register's scope to "interrelated aspects" not strictly having to do with production and stockpiling but characterized tangentially and summarily as including military holdings and procurement. Similarly, mention is made not of transfers of pure military technology, but only of transfers of high technology with military applications.

These elaborations constitute not so much a decision as a future possibility which would take shape in 1994 and which would be analysed on the basis of the work of a group of experts and the opinions of Member States, but also in the light of the Conference on Disarmament and its proceedings. There is no doubt in my mind that the broadening of the register to include so-called "interrelated aspects" is only a possibility and, frankly, a rather remote possibility.

As a member of the multilateral negotiating body, Cuba is unfortunately well aware that certain matters are deferred under the cover of consensus - which sometimes effectively becomes a veto. Everyone knows how certain aspects of nuclear armaments are treated in discussions held by the aforementioned body; the cessation of nuclear testing is only one clear example of this.

The draft resolution does not specify that the proposed register will be broadly inclusive, even though its proponents emphasize that it will be and point to its title as proof.

My delegation is well aware that the decisions of the General Assembly have the status of recommendations for Member States; they are not legally

(Mr. Rivero del Rosario, Cuba)

binding. But the text we have before us does not indicate that participation in the register is voluntary, because the sponsors of the draft resolution did not agree to make this explicit. My delegation and other delegations present can only wonder why: why is it that explicit mention of the voluntary nature of the register has been omitted?

As we said on 21 October 1991 during the general debate, we are talking here about transparency in arms transfers; the next step, which may come about in no time, is the idea of limiting transfers. Today's draft resolution is a clear first step toward perhaps determining - according to unspecified criteria - whether a particular State may or may not import arms for its defence. But those States that produce and stockpile such weapons will not be subject to such limitations.

The annex to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, with its list of specific arms categories, deserves special mention here. Undoubtedly, it was thoroughly studied by the major military Powers and the Governments of countries sponsoring the draft; many of these States have had considerable experience in conventional disarmament negotiations in Europe, following agreements that my delegation has of course welcomed, as have we all. But we wonder whether those arms categories happen to be precisely the ones that should appear here from the very beginning. Is the list complete? Should it include others? I wonder whether the Governments of Asian, African and Latin American countries do not also have the right to study the matter as the Europeans have already done, and to offer their opinions as to which arms categories should be included in the register from the start - or must we simply accept what would undoubtedly be an imposition?

(Mr. Rivero del Rosario, Cuba)

In the judgement of my delegation, the proposal we have before us now is partial in nature, and, no matter what the text says to the contrary, it is discriminatory. The way it is presented leads us to doubt seriously its universality. We acknowledge, however, the effort made by a group of delegations, which have held numerous consultations in order to seek common ground among the various positions represented. None the less, unfortunately, the text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev. 1, as amended orally, fails to meet the legitimate security concerns which my delegation regards as a minimum requirement for us to be able to endorse this proposal.

For these reasons, my delegation is unable to support the draft resolution in its present form, and we shall therefore vote against it. We request a recorded vote.

Mr. HOU ZHITONG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): China has an independent foreign policy of peace, and therefore supports all proposals and measures truly conducive to the maintenance of world peace and security. China is in favour of careful consideration by the United Nations of transparency in international arms transfers, including the issue of a United Nations register on conventional arms transfers. We believe that the aim of transparency, where appropriate in international arms transfers, is to build confidence and enhance peace and security. As the Secretary-General pointed out in his study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms:

> "It is, therefore, only feasible when countries participating in related measures find that it serves their national and international security interests." (A/46/301, para. 14).

In the First Committee this year, no other topic has given rise to such heated discussion, intense debate or frequent consultations as the establishment of a United Nations register. This is entirely understandable, because this issue, of great importance and complexity, has a direct bearing on the security interests of all countries and regions. Issues where the vital interests of countries concerned are at stake should be addressed with circumspection. In this exercise, I feel, a reasonable, comprehensive and balanced approach should be adopted.

Many delegations have rightly pointed out that transparency in international arms transfers and in a register is not an end in itself but a means for enhancing peace, security and stability in the countries and regions concerned. Owing to the differences in security environments, defence needs and different degrees of reliance on arms imports, countries are affected differently by the same transparency in arms transfers.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

Many questions should be treated seriously, as for example: how to ensure that the register in question is in accordance with legitimate rights to self-defence as enshrined in the Charter; how to reflect the principle of undiminished security for all countries and how to prevent the use of arms transfers to infringe the sovereignty of States, interfere in their internal affairs or support secessionist activities; and how to achieve true universality and non-discrimination. These are all extremely complex issues that warrant further in-depth and careful study and solution.

To this end a consensus should be sought on the basis of adequate and extensive consultation among all countries on an equal footing and with full regard for the legitimate concerns and the reasonable demands of all countries, particularly the many importer countries. It goes without saying that only a reasonable and feasible register that is universally accepted can play a positive part and contribute to international peace and security.

In this connection, the Chinese delegation will continue to cooperate constructively with all other delegations in working towards enhanced international peace and security. Because of the foregoing considerations, the Chinese delegation will abstain in the vote on revised draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1.

Ms. MASON (Canada): The Gulf War demonstrated the urgent need to extend transparency to the hitherto untouched field of conventional arms acquisition, to extend it on a global basis and to extend it immediately. To fulfil its confidence-building potential, the register must be effective. It must be as broadly supported as possible and must include both suppliers and recipients. It must present an accurate picture of arms accumulation and it must be non-discriminatory to those who rely on arms imports to supply their defence needs.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

These were the criteria against which Canada measured draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18 and found it wanting. And this is why Canada was particularly gratified when the sponsors of the draft resolution, the European Community and Japan, "came to understand that more and wider concerns had to be addressed than simply the question of international arms transfers" and agreed that "the scope of of the draft resolution had to be enlarged". (A/C.1/46/PV.35, pp. 3-5) While the result, draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, still did not go as far as many, including Canada, would have liked, it none the less represented a very solid step in the right direction. It would put in place a register of conventional arms and provided for the inclusion of data on transfers within a specified time frame. Secondly, an evolutionary process was put in place, encompassing a number of further elements, including military holdings and national production, in particular.

That is why Canada was pleased to co-sponsor the revised draft resolution and why we fully endorse the commitment embodied in it to the early development of a comprehensive register and its full implementation. It therefore follows that Canada welcomed the further oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, introduced by the Netherlands delegation from the floor, which further enhance the equality of the two pillars of the register, transfers on the one hand and production on the other.

Canada intends to continue its active interest and participation in all aspects of the evolutionary process set in motion by this draft resolution, both in the context of the United Nations General Assembly and in that of the Conference on Disarmament. At the latter we will work hard to ensure a timely and complete conclusion of the tasks referred to it under this draft

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

resolution. Canada has already provided to the Secretary-General for the calendar year 1990 data on Canada's exports of military equipment. We intend to provide an even more comprehensive report for 1991. With respect to our first formal reporting to the register, for calendar year 1992, we intend to provide both data for arms transfers, pursuant to operative paragraph 9, and information on Canada's military holdings and national production, pursuant to operative paragraph 10.

We hope that other Member States will demonstrate a similar commitment to the full implementation of a comprehensive register, first by their support, here and now, for this draft resolution and, in the days ahead, by providing data on both transfers and national production at the earliest possible opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): For many years the General Assembly has been alerting the international community to the dangers of the arms race and to the social and economic consequences of the tremendous military budgets on which it is based. The Government of Mexico has advocated greater transparency in military budgets and in everything connected with the design, development, production, transfer and accumulation of weapons - beginning with nuclear weapons and their systems and other types of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, we have tried to focus attention on the central role to be played by the United Nations in the area of disarmament.

For this reason, the Government of Mexico viewed sympathetically the proposal put forward last May by the Government of Japan with a view to having established, within the United Nations, an international register on weapons transfers - the ways and means to be carefully considered by a panel in 1992. This proposal aroused the interest of other countries, and very soon another initiative, with a slightly different focus, was put forward by the European Economic Community, which of course, includes some of the largest suppliers of weapons in the world. There were contacts between Japan and the countries of the Community, and the joint text that was prepared appears in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18.

During the past month there have been consultations between the 13 sponsors of the draft resolution and other delegations, including those of the non-aligned group, but there has been no agreement on a text that would command unanimous support in the First Committee; and the result of these consultations is the text in L.18/Rev.1. On the basis of the amendments to

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

the text in document A/C.1/46/L.48, which were distributed today, new consultations took place. The results of these have just been presented by the representative of the Netherlands. But we must be very clear about exactly what we should be approving if we were to accept those amendments. Of course, we shall have to make adjustments in paragraph 7 of the Spanish text so that it will faithfully reflect the English version.

What would be established is a register of conventional armaments, including data on their transfer. We would not be establishing a register that clearly and as of now encompassed the production of conventional weapons or weapons of mass destruction, as many representatives have suggested we should. The main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 seem to prefer that the First Committee take a decision on this draft as soon as possible. My delegation will vote in favour of it, but we are a little surprised that some of these sponsors said only a few days ago, in this very room, that, as the Geneva Conference on Disarmament is working on the basis of consensus, General Assembly resolutions related to the work of the Conference should also be based on consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 recommends a further task for the Conference on Disarmament, and, as we understand it, will not be the subject of a decision without a vote. In accordance with its rules, the General Assembly reaches decisions by a vote or without a vote. But consensus is not a form of decision-making; it is more or less the result of a process of consultations aimed at producing texts that enjoy general support. That is what all of us in this Committee try to achieve: we try to produce texts that command general agreement. But at times problems persist and, just for the sake of achieving some sort of consensus at all costs, or even having a

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

so-called consensus imposed on us, we must not stray from the rules of the General Assembly.

That is why my delegation suggests that the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 should be the first to provide the data necessary for the effective functioning of the register that is to be set up. Thus they would be setting an example and encouraging other States to abide by their own commitments and to improve a system that, over the long term, might build confidence and strengthen the role of the United Nations in the area of disarmament.

Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1.

The delegation of Sri Lanka fully supports this resolution, which deals with international arms transfers, with special reference to the illicit arms trade. The draft resolution was sponsored by the delegation of Colombia and several others. We appreciate the work done by the representative of Colombia, and her efforts to place before the Committee a very important and most timely draft resolution.

This draft resolution is long overdue as illicit arms transfers have resulted in massive damage and in the destruction of life and property in many developing countries. The development efforts of these countries have been set back many years as a result of the acquisition of military equipment and military technology by terrorist groups. Some terrorist groups have acquired these weapons through intimidation and drug trafficking and by other devious means. One of the most dangerous aspects of illicit arms transfers is their connection with drug trafficking. This destroys not only innocent populations but also young people who are growing up and future generations. Unless

(Mr. Rasaputram, Sri Lanka)

preventive action is taken, brokers, salesmen and arms producers will always be prepared, for the sake of money, to accommodate those who are engaged in illicit arms transfers. If these transfers continue they will negate the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament - the role of peace-keeping and peace-making.

The draft resolution emphasizes that illicit arms trafficking poses dangers with regard to the pursuit of a peaceful international order. We feel that the United Nations must step in at this time and devise ways and means not just of reducing illicit transfers but of eradicating them completely, and all Member States must help in this process. Terrorist groups operate on a transboundary basis and, thus, endanger peace in regions and subregions. The illicit arms trade across boundaries, together with the corresponding displacement and movement of people, is a matter for very serious concern. We must take concrete and progressive measures to put an end to the most dangerous situation that has arisen as a result of illicit arms transfers and drug trafficking. For the sake of peace and development, the United Nations must accomplish this task.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the honour of explaining Pakistan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 - entitled "Transparency in armaments" - as amended.

Pakistan fully supports the concept of transparency in armaments so long as it simultaneously and comprehensively takes into account all related and integrally linked aspects and helps to enhance the building of confidence between States, particularly at the regional level, with the ultimate objective of ensuring the equal and undiminished security of States at the lowest level of armaments.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

The accumulation of armaments in various regions of the world is a result of a number of factors: unresolved territorial disputes, denial of the right of self-determination, ambitions for regional hegemony by the militarily most significant States, and foreign occupation and military intervention. One of the most important issues to be addressed by the international community is therefore the peaceful resolution of outstanding conflicts and disputes. Only thus would proposals for transparency in armaments succeed in their essential objective, and the process of regional and international peace and security be strengthened. Transparency is not an end in itself.

Pakistan has consistently held the view that the question of transparency in armaments - and specifically of conventional arms transfers - should be considered within the overall context of arms control in all its other inseparable and integrally linked aspects, particularly the indigenous production capabilities of different countries as well as the legitimate security concerns of States. These aspects must be taken into account simultaneously and in an integrated manner.

It is the view of my delegation that arms control measures that are partial, that address only selected aspects of a multifaceted issue, or that are discriminatory in nature or unbalanced in the treatment of different elements cannot be implemented successfully. This is particularly true of measures that focus on transparency in international arms transfers while relegating to a different plane such equally important issues as the indigenous armaments production capabilities of States, existing stockpiles of weapons or the transfer of armaments technology.

We appreciate the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution have moved considerably away from their original text to accommodate partially some of these concerns. It is, however, with a sense of disappointment and regret

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

that my delegation finds that the position reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended a few minutes ago, remains short of these objectives. In essence, we should like the General Assembly to endorse the establishment of a comprehensive, universal, non-discriminatory and voluntary register that would simultaneously include and treat at par the indigenous production capabilities of States, stockpiles, international transfers, delivery systems, and the question of transfer of armaments technology.

For those reasons, my delegation will be constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 as orally amended.

Mr. DANKWA (Ghana): As is probably now well known, the Ghana delegation took an active part in the process that culminated in the emergence of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1. We welcome in all sincerity the amendments that have been made by the representative of the Netherlands on behalf of the sponsors.

By this draft resolution, as orally amended, the General Assembly will be establishing a universal and non-discriminatory register of conventional arms at United Nations Headquarters, on the generally shared desire to promote transparency in armaments.

In view of the political significance of the draft resolution, particularly in the efforts of the international community to establish a new world order, Ghana finds it necessary to place on record its understanding of the draft resolution, an understanding that has determined my delegation's position on it.

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

It will be recalled that in the statement it made during the general debate on disarmament issues Ghana expressed its readiness to join the initiative to establish a United Nations register of arms transfers and urged that efforts be deployed to maximize the impact of that register. We questioned the unexamined assumption that a register would necessarily help build mutual confidence and strengthen overall security. We drew attention to the limitations of the study on the basis of which the register was being proposed. We argued in particular that the study had fallen short of two essential features that it was supposed to possess - universality and non-discrimination. A non-discriminatory and universal register should, at the very least, cover transfers from production to user and stockpile locations. We expressed the view that a lot of work had to be done on the proposed register in order to enhance the prospects of its effectiveness as a contribution to disarmament.

Our position is informed by the lessons we have drawn from colonialism. As we indicated in our statement during the general debate, we do not believe that the peace of the world will be secured by disarming the majority, with a few constituting themselves the policemen of the world. It is true that the register, as established under this draft resolution as orally amended, is labelled "register of conventional arms". But it is not our understanding that the register is ultimately intended to be limited to conventional arms alone.

Ultimately, the register is to cover all types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction. We have taken note of the view that efforts are currently under way in multilateral forums, such as the Conference on Disarmament, and in bilateral settings to reach agreements that will promote

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

transparency in non-conventional armaments. These efforts are to be seen as complementary to the efforts of the United Nations, particularly the First Committee.

Even though the Ghana delegation had set out primarily to have a register that would consist, in terms of reporting on the basis of a format, of all aspects of conventional armaments, we are satisfied that paragraph 7, even as amended, starts the process on a realistic basis. It is the understanding of my delegation that the draft resolution is establishing a register that consists of information on military holdings, on procurement through national production and imports - the latter being euphemistically referred to as transfers - and then on relevant policies.

The only difference we see lies in the form of reporting. Whereas information on transfers will be reported strictly in the form of data on the basis of the technical procedures and input requirements as set out in the annex and as would be improved by the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session, information on military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies will not be in the form of data.

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

These differences will, however, continue until the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly. This, in effect, means that the partial discrimination in the form of reporting will have to be eliminated after the submission of two reports.

The Ghanaian delegation is not unaware of the scepticism that has been expressed about the role that has been assigned to the Conference on Disarmament as far as the elaboration of the scope of the register to incorporate all related aspects is concerned. To some extent, we share in this scepticism. However, we believe that since the Conference on Disarmament is already engaged in some of the aspects, notably those relating to non-conventional armaments, it is only proper and fair that it should be given an opportunity to make its contribution to the collective effort to promote transparency in armaments.

It is our understanding that the work of the group of governmental experts, which is to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, will not be contingent exclusively upon the submission, or otherwise, of the views of Member States or on the completion, or otherwise, of the work assigned to the Conference on Disarmament. In other words, the group of governmental experts will, irrespective of the responses of Member States or the work of the Conference on Disarmament, have to meet and submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session.

What is even more important for the Ghanaian delegation in terms of understanding is that, under operative paragraph 11 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, the General Assembly will have to decide at its forty-ninth session on, first, whether or not the register will continue in its present form with its inherent partial discrimination; secondly, whether

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

or not the register should be developed to include non-conventional weapons; and, thirdly, how, and not if - and I stress, Mr. Chairman, how, and not if - the register should be developed in terms of reporting to incorporate military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies.

The Ghanaian delegation wishes to place on record its expectation and hope that, given the good will that permitted the process that led to the measures in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 - even as orally amended - the register of conventional arms will evolve within the two years starting from 1993 into the comprehensive, universal and non-discriminatory register, in terms of both scope and reportage, that we all desire.

It is on the basis of this understanding that the Ghanaian delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia): The establishment of the United Nations register of conventional arms is one of the major initiatives launched this year in the First Committee, and the view of my delegation is that it represents a great contribution to the promotion of transparency and confidence-building measures. Also, this contribution can be made manifest through all forms of international cooperation ranging from coalitions between neighbouring States to strengthening regional security and international security as a whole.

In view of its importance, the non-aligned countries carefully considered the initiative of the European Community and Japan on the establishment of the United Nations register of conventional arms. Since this question concerns the vital interests of each and every country, the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which Yugoslavia is the current Chairman, feel that, in the process of considering this question, all members of the international

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

community should actively participate. In that context, from the very beginning, in consultations among themselves as well as with the initiators of this proposal and with other countries, the non-aligned countries adopted a constructive approach in order that the final result might be endorsed by the General Assembly. They have, accordingly, adopted a principled position in negotiations.

The basic guidelines for the non-aligned countries in the negotiations were that any reporting system or register of armaments should be universal, comprehensive, voluntary and non-discriminatory. As a compromise emerged between the original position of the European Community and Japan - to limit the scope of the register to transfers of conventional arms only, as opposed to the comprehensive system advocated by the non-aligned countries - we obviously became aware that this initiative should inevitably be viewed as an evolving and phased process.

My delegation, which played an active part in these negotiations, believes that there still exists a common understanding - and, if I may say, agreement - by all parties on the basic principles of a comprehensive system of this kind. Regrettably, I must say that certain differences have also surfaced, concerning the degree of commitment to establishing a fully comprehensive register, the timetable for its establishment, implementation and development, and the ways and means of achieving it.

In the view of the Yugoslav delegation, the text before us represents a realistic compromise, one which we were able to achieve at this particular time. It certainly does not reflect all the concerns that the non-aligned countries endeavoured to include, but, at the same time, it departs to a large extent from the original proposal submitted by Japan and the European Community.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

In conclusion, I can say only that we have all learned from this process of negotiation. Therefore, we are particularly grateful to the countries which initiated this draft resolution - the countries of the European Community, and Japan - and especially to our chairman in these negotiations, the Ambassador of the Netherlands Mr. Wagenmakers, for the manner in which they approached and conducted these negotiations.

We should like to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members of the Committee, that we are all in favour of transparency in armaments, of confidence-building measures and, ultimately, of a more secure, better world. Although there obviously exist certain doubts and differences, which are not only recognized but also appreciated, we, the delegation of Yugoslavia, nevertheless believe that this draft resolution deserves to be adopted without a vote.

Mr. JAIN (India): My delegation will be pleased to vote in support of the draft resolution on transparency in armaments (A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1), as orally amended. This will be in conformity with our belief, as we said in our statement during the general debate in the First Committee, that steps should be taken to curb the trend towards arms build-up at both the national and the global level (A/C.1/46/PV.7, pp. 13-14), which affects developing countries in particular and in more than one way. We also welcome the proposal to make international arms transfers more transparent through a United Nations register, as proposed in the draft resolution before us.

Our support and sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1, on international arms transfers, is in pursuance of the same objectives in respect of the illicit arms trade, which is most disturbing and dangerous because of its destabilizing and destructive effects through its fuelling of phenomena such as terrorism, subversion and drug trafficking.

(Mr. Jain, India)

In supporting draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, my delegation would, however, like to underscore the universal and non-discriminatory aspects of the proposed register as, indeed, is specified in its operative paragraph 7. We also consider it essential, and we stress, that the obligations assumed under the draft resolution be implemented simultaneously by all Member States.

Mr. STELZER (Austria): From the outset Austria has welcomed the initiative to promote a United Nations-based-arms-transfer register as an important confidence-building measure. In order to meet its most important requirements - a non-discriminatory character and universal adherence - the envisaged concept of subsequent expansion had to be advanced, to ensure the conditions for broad acceptance. Austria commends all delegations involved for their efforts to achieve a text which seems balanced to us because it takes into account diverse concerns.

We hope that the draft resolution on transparency in armaments with the oral amendments introduced by the Netherlands will command voluntary and universal adherence. Austria is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 and urges all countries to contribute to its follow-up process.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, which was orally amended at this meeting, has 40 sponsors and was introduced by the representatives of Japan and the Netherlands at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1991. The list of sponsors of the draft resolution is as follows: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Belarus, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Samoa, Sweden, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Venezuela.

I should also like, on behalf of the Secretary-General, to read out the following statement with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended, regarding transparency in armaments; and with respect to document A/C.1/46/L.49, which was circulated earlier, concerning the programme-budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1.

By the oral amendments to revised draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", the General Assembly would extend the work of the panel of governmental technical experts as originally elaborated in operative paragraph 8 of the revised draft resolution. In this connection, the panel would now hold three sessions, instead of two, in New York in 1992 for a total of five weeks, instead of three. A total of seven work-months of consultancy services, instead of five, and three work-months of temporary assistance of secretarial support services, instead of two, would now be required. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt the revised draft resolution as orally amended, the financial implications contained in document A/C.1/46/L.49 on the revised draft resolution would also be amended to reflect an increase of $98,700 in estimated conference-servicing costs for which no additional resources would be required under section 32, "Conference Services", and additional requirements of $113,200 for non-conference services costs, under section 5 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended..

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Cuba

Abstaining: China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iraq, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Singapore, Sudan

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted by 106 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1 has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1991. The list of sponsors of the draft resolution is as follows: Afghanistan, Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Italy, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Samoa, Spain and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Before we take action on the draft resolution I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to make a statement, on behalf of the Secretary-General, on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "International arms transfers".

By draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1 the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements to make available for consultation by Member States relevant information provided to him by Member States concerning national legislation and/or regulations on arms exports, imports and procurement, and administrative procedures, as regards both authorization of arms transfers and prevention of the illicit arms trade.

The Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to publish the information provided to him by Member States in accordance with national judicial procedures regarding arms and military equipment, seized by authorities, destined for the use of terrorists, drug traffickers, organized

(Mr. Kheradi)

crime and for mercenary and other destabilizing activities, when this would assist the eradication of illicit arms trade.

The Assembly would further request the Secretary-General to assist, upon request and within available resources, in holding meetings and seminars at the national, regional and international levels, as pertinent, concerning inter alia the concept of transparency as a confidence-building measure, the destructive and destabilizing effects of the illicit traffic in arms, the development of internationally harmonized laws and administrative procedures relating to official arms procurement and arms transfer policies, and regional and international efforts to eradicate the illicit traffic in arms.

It is the understanding of the Secretary-General that these activities would not be fully operational in 1992 and that assistance would be given within available resources. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to receive relevant information from Member States, to publish such information and to assist in holding meetings and seminars as may be required does not have any programme budget implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: As the sponsors of the draft resolution expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote, if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): I should like to explain my delegations vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 as orally revised. At the outset I should like to take this opportunity to convey to the delegations of the

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

Netherlands, France, Japan, the United Kingdom and all other delegations which participated in the long and arduous negotiations on the draft resolution, the appreciation of the delegation of Egypt for the sincere and faithful manner in which they conducted those consultations.

Egypt supports the objectives of the draft resolution and has demonstrated all along its willingness to work constructively for their achievement. We note with satisfaction that the consultations in this regard were characterized by the equal commitment of all the participants to work in good faith and with resolve and determination to reach a positive outcome. We also realize the extent of the progress made during these negotiations on the subject and the spirit of understanding and cooperation that was displayed by all parties.

The changes introduced orally by the representative of the Netherlands on behalf of the sponsors confirm once again the positive approach of addressing the issue taking into account the concerns of all parties on an equitable basis.

My delegation would have preferred more clear-cut commitments with regard to the production and transfer of technology in the field of armaments as well as of weapons of mass destruction, although the delegation of Egypt realizes that the changes introduced into draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 have met many, if not all, of our concerns. In the light of these changes there is now a possibility that we will be able to establish a truly universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory international register of armaments, a register that could contribute effectively to international peace and security, that would accommodate legitimate security concerns and would

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

provide the broadest degree of transparency so as to eliminate suspicion and doubt, which in many instances are the primary cause of conflict, a register that would incorporate weapons of mass destruction at a specified time.*

---

* Mr. Alpman (Turkey), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

It is also of importance that on this occasion we should state most clearly that the resolution just adopted does not affect in any manner the priorities of disarmament as contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Transparency is not a negotiable commodity but a conceptual whole and must be dealt with accordingly. As generally agreed, it is not an end in itself but simply a means contributing towards the elimination of the threat that armaments of all types continue to pose.

I do hope that I am justified in stating that my delegation has reasons to be cautiously optimistic that the resolution as amended may achieve its objectives, namely, the easing of tensions and conflict situations globally or regionally, without - and I repeat, without - in any way placing the national security of any State in jeopardy. If a General Assembly resolution is to be effective, it should promote the national interests of all States.

We draw attention to the fact that this draft resolution sets in motion a complex mechanism for the elaboration of the Register. For the success of that ambitious and well-founded project, we must jointly exhibit our ability to arrive, through common understanding and good faith at concrete and tangible agreements concerning the format, input requirements and procedures for the functioning of the Register. We can guarantee the proper functioning of this new mechanism. Only through such a process, in which every State is accorded its sovereign right, on the basis of equality as enshrined in the Charter, to express its opinion and arrive freely at decisions on all major issues which directly affect its national security.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

Therefore we shall all be following closely and scrutinizing the new experiment to evaluate the degree to which this proposal has contributed to the achievement of our common objective. I wish to put it on record that we reserve our right to express our views on the future functioning of the Register, including the possibility of a new General Assembly resolution expanding the scope of the Register if the need should arise.

We are confident that the United Nations, in which we have placed our faith since its inception, is the appropriate forum through which we may reach the necessary agreements and continue to pursue the goals of disarmament.

Mr. SUZIEDELIS (Lithuania): Lithuania, which has only recently recovered its freedom and independence, strongly supports all measures that strengthen peace and increase confidence and security between the nations of the world.

Therefore my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 on transparency in armaments. However, to my delegation's regret, it is not entirely confident that Lithuania will be able to fulfil the requirement of paragraph 2 of the annex to the draft resolution.

There are considerable numbers of Soviet forces stationed in Lithuania without any agreement by Lithuania's Government and without its consent. The Soviet Government and the High Command of its forces have not yet informed the Lithuanian Government about the numbers of those Soviet troops and their armaments. Thus the Lithuanian Government does not possess the information as to the number of items in different categories imported into or exported from Lithuania's territory by Soviet forces.

(Mr. Suziedelis, Lithuania)

My Government is deeply concerned about the illegal presence of Soviet forces on our country's soil. Because our Government believes that that situation constitutes a potential danger to peace and security in the Baltic region, it may appeal in the future to the United Nations to consider measures to remove the potential danger to peace in our region. We hope that the States Members of the United Nations will support that appeal.

Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Algeria would like to explain its position of non-participation in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 concerning international arms transfers. We took that position, inter alia, because, first, we did not have enough time to consider in detail the orally introduced new amendments to the draft resolution in question. Secondly, given our position on the main aspects of the draft, we wish to explain that our delegation, since the very start of consultations and negotiations, called for a rapprochement of the various points of view by taking into account the global elements and the voluntary aspects of the matter and the question of the transfer of technology in order to establish the Register.

These elements are essential to the viability of the system, but, regrettably, they have not been taken into account.

For those reasons, we have decided not to take part in the vote on this draft resolution in the Committee.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): My delegation has gone along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1. This is, however, without any prejudice to the views of the Government of Pakistan on the general question of international arms transfers, as circulated in General Assembly

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

document A/45/363 of 20 August 1990, and my delegation's explanation of vote on General Assembly resolution 44/116 N of 15 December 1989.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as amended orally.

Clearly, the production and transfer of armaments are intimately linked to the strategic, military, political, humanitarian, economic and commercial interests of many States, and the situation of each State and its approach to those interests will greatly affect whether we move towards a solution of the problems caused by the excessive accumulation of arms.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

For Colombia - and we think for most developing countries - our chief concern is to maintain the impetus of social and economic development by allowing minimum expenditures on armaments, without endangering our security. Poverty and underdevelopment are sources of insecurity in the world, and only development will lead to an atmosphere of peace in which long-standing practices of confrontation between States will give way to harmony, transparency, dialogue and cooperation, making possible a world free from the scourge of war and the heavy burden of armaments.

In draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally revised, and presented to the Committee by the European Community and Japan, emphasis is placed on the need to prevent, by non-discriminatory measures, the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms. The text opts for a register of conventional arms reflecting transparency in armaments as a confidence-building measure, thereby lessening tensions and strengthening regional and international peace, while at the same time reducing military production and arms transfers.

The merits of transparency are thus expressed in the draft resolution. Consequently, my delegation could not but support the initiative for the establishment of a register, especially if it is intended thereby to rectify past practices which led to an arms build-up and contributed to armed conflicts. We particularly appreciate the thought that went into the concern to guarantee international security by reducing arms to the lowest possible levels.

To the extent that the transparency reflected in the register tangibly fulfils the purposes set forth in the preamble to the draft resolution, the initiative has our support. It will be necessary therefore to respect the

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

phases outlined in the operative part of the draft resolution in order to broaden the register to encompass all the various arsenals and categories of weapons, from the smallest arms to weapons of mass destruction. This commitment is absolutely essential.

To the best of its ability, our delegation undertakes to commit all its enthusiasm and exert every effort to ensure that the register will really fulfil the requirements of non-discrimination which transparency entails, so that the endeavour will become a meritorious and universal one.

Mr. AWAD (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to explain my country's position on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, on which the Committee has just voted. I would merely say that my country's position with regard to the draft resolution is compatible with that expressed by the Permanent Representative of Egypt.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of my own delegation and the delegations of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, inasmuch as draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote, I would merely say that we have reservations with regard to its paragraph 5.

Mr. TUN (Myanmar): I have asked to speak to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended. In view of the growing threat to international peace and security brought about by the excessive build-up of conventional weapons in many regions of the world, Myanmar welcomes and strongly supports efforts to remove that threat. We are therefore encouraged by the communiqué that was issued by the five permanent members of the Security Council in London last month, reaffirming that they would seek fair, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced measures on arms

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

control at global and regional levels. We consider it significant that they agreed on the principles that arms transfers should be conducive to enhancing the legitimate defence capability of the recipient country, that it should not exacerbate regional tension, and that such transfers should not be used as a means of interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. Similarly, Myanmar notes with appreciation the Secretary-General's study (A/46/301) on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms.

Notwithstanding this, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. Despite the oral amendment, we found it wanting. Myanmar firmly believes that measures to promote transparency in the international transfer of conventional arms will be effective only when the issue is addressed comprehensively in a fair and non-discriminatory manner, taking fully into account the legitimate security concerns of States large and small in different regions of the world, and their sovereign right to individual and collective self-defence, as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

My delegation also finds extraneous the attempt in the seventh preambular paragraph to introduce a link between transparency in conventional arms and the issue of human rights. My delegation believes that the matter of measures aimed at promoting transparency is a vital one and that to achieve its confidence-building potential, it should be addressed judiciously in order to secure universal acceptance. For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting.

My delegation would, however, like to place on record its appreciation to all delegations for their sincere efforts to achieve consensus on this vital issue.

Mr. PROTHMAN (Namibia): As this is the first time my delegation has spoken in the First Committee, let me congratulate the Chairman and the other officers on their elections.

I wish to explain my delegation's deliberate non-participation in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended. As a matter of principle, the short time available to study the oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1 made it impossible for my delegation to cast a well-considered vote.

Mr. HASSAN (Sudan): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, "Transparency in armaments", as orally amended.

My country believes in the importance of establishing at United Nations Headquarters a register of armaments, so as to make a positive contribution towards achieving some of the objectives of disarmament. It is our conviction that from the very start such a register should cover all types of weapons, conventional and non-conventional, that it should be comprehensive and non-discriminatory and that it should include both suppliers and recipients. In my Government's view, the register, also from the very start, should be broadened to include the production of arms and stockpiling. That not being the case with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, my delegation had no alternative but to abstain in the voting.

Mr. KIM (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended, for the following reasons.

First, it is our feeling that the draft resolution is rather one-sided and is more binding on developing arms-buying countries than on developed arms-selling countries. It does not mention the real factors connected with

(Mr. Kim, Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

arms transfers. Devoid of prior restrictions and curbs on the production, export or transfer of armaments and on politically oriented military aid, the register system might in fact undermine confidence and instigate an arms race among recipient countries.*

Secondly, my delegation considers it very important that the register system should include nuclear weapons deployed in foreign countries, which can be considered as a sort of arms transfer. A register of nuclear weapons would surely be a very important step forward in establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall call now on representatives wishing to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind representatives that the number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting is limited to two. The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting is limited to 10 minutes, and the second intervention to 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I wish to reply to the statement made this morning by the representative of Australia, who spoke in connection with items under discussion this morning. Those items have no relation to my country. Therefore, my delegation rejects flatly what the representative of Australia said, as a politically motivated provocation aimed at creating pressure on us and damaging our dignity.

---

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Kim, Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

At the same time, we do not understand why Australia, which is so worried about our fictitious nuclear development programme, is not worried at all about the nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea, but rather feels at ease with them. Those weapons are a threat to us and are a violation of the spirit of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We have stated our position on this problem on many occasions. If there is to be a settlement with respect to the safeguards agreement, it is essential to remove nuclear weapons from South Korea and to renounce the nuclear "umbrella", which is in fact a nuclear threat to us and which is not necessary at all, because there is no danger of nuclear "rain" from the north.

This is a very small but very precious right that belongs to us under the NPT, a right we cannot give up at any cost. I should like once again to remind the representative of Australia that putting pressure upon us is not the right way to solve the problem.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): Our views on the matters raised by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have been spelt out in considerable detail under item 14 in plenary meetings of the General Assembly, and I shall let our position rest at that.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): While I had not intended to make a statement at this stage, I feel compelled to speak, since the representative of North Korea has touched upon irrelevant issues relating to the Republic of Korea. My delegation finds it necessary to clarify its position by the exercise of the right of reply.

My delegation should like to stress our non-nuclear policy. We have made our position in this regard very clear. As representatives may note in document A/46/621, on 8 November the President of the Republic of Korea made a special declaration on our non-nuclear, non-chemical and non-biological weapons policy initiative, which is in keeping with the changing international situation. I should like to quote some extracts from the declaration:

"The Republic of Korea will use nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes and will not manufacture, possess, store, deploy or use nuclear weapons."

"The Republic of Korea will continue to submit to comprehensive international inspection all nuclear-related facilities and materials on its territory in compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its safeguards agreement and will not possess nuclear-fuel reprocessing and enrichment facilities."

"The Republic of Korea aspires to a world of peace, free of nuclear weapons, as well as all weapons of indiscriminate killing, and we will actively participate in international efforts towards the total elimination of chemical and biological weapons and observe all international agreements thereupon. Now there can be no reason or justification for North Korea to develop nuclear weapons or evade international inspection of its nuclear facilities."

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, who wishes to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. KIM (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): While I was not addressing the representative of South Korea, he was very quick to respond. You see, they have nuclear weapons in their territory. He has just referred to Mr. Roh Tae Woo's declaration on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. We are very glad that the South Korean authorities have begun to accept our proposals. We have, on many occasions, put forward proposals for a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and we did so again during the North-South talks at Pyongyang in October. At that time the South Korean authorities rejected our proposal. Now they speak of denuclearization, but we are not sure about what they say because they make no mention of the withdrawal of foreign nuclear weapons from South Korea. The stationing of such nuclear weapons in South Korea, the territory of our country, is a serious threat to our nation. Hence, we are now requesting - demanding - that nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from South Korea. When this has been achieved and South Korea renounces the nuclear umbrella of the foreign countries, we will be ready to allow simultaneous on-the-spot inspections to verify whether nuclear weapons are really stationed in our territory. We are ready to allow inspections at any time, as we have stated on several occasions.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Republic of Korea, who wishes to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): My delegation has made our position clear in the policy statement I have just referred to, which has been

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

circulated as document A/46/621. The statement has clearly and unequivocally defined our policy on the nuclear issue. Therefore North Korea's continued claims that our policy has not been adequately expressed and its request for further clarification are unworthy of reply. Moreover, they should be construed as merely a façade for hiding North Korea's unwillingness to submit its nuclear facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency, as is mandatory under the NPT regime.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of, and action on, draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items, namely, items 47 to 65.

I should like to take this opportunity to make some brief observations on the successful conclusion of this phase of our work. Developments in the field of arms control and disarmament have occurred at such a rapid pace recently that a number of definitions, which have long formed the benchmarks of our work in disarmament, have perhaps themselves undergone transformation. There is a growing realization, for instance, that the military dimension of security cannot be isolated from an array of economic, environmental and social problems around the world. The multidimensional approach to peace and security - to which the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs referred in the Committee - has taken on new relevance. Similarly, the focus of debate on the question of nuclear weapons appears to have shifted from efforts towards controlling the increase of nuclear arms to actually cutting nuclear stockpiles through mutual and stable reductions and controlling their proliferation.

(The Chairman)

During the current session, while nuclear issues still occupy a major focus in the agenda of disarmament items, events in the Persian Gulf and elsewhere have heightened the Committee's awareness of the threat of weapons of mass destruction as well of conventional arms build-ups.

The disarmament agenda thus appears to be widening, as questions of conventional disarmament and, in particular, transparency in armaments and transfers of conventional weapons, as well as regional disarmament, are areas in which opportunities for cooperative action can be discerned.

The impact of these recent developments has been felt in not only the tone but the substance of the deliberations of the First Committee on disarmament items. The dramatic announcements on short-range nuclear weapons by the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as well as the recent accessions and statements of intent of accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty by a number of Member States, are only a few of the many developments which have been highlighted in the general debate and in the draft resolutions of the Committee. Issues such as non-proliferation, arms transfers and transparency in armaments have been the centre of attention in the capitals of the world, and the First Committee has thus been well positioned to make a significant contribution in matters of such importance.

This year, once again, the Committee witnessed a decline in the number of draft resolutions, reflecting further moves towards consolidation and rationalization of the items on the agenda as well as the impact which the rapid developments of the recent past have had on the Committee's work. In the light of a number of recent initiatives in the area of chemical weapons, for example, it is noteworthy that the draft resolution on chemical and

(The Chairman)

bacteriological (biological) weapons may perhaps be the last Committee draft resolution calling for the completion of the chemical weapons convention.

In general, while the means of addressing a series of long-standing problems in the area of disarmament was still the subject of debate in the Committee, there appeared to be a greater determination to surmount these problems and to find common ground. Three years ago in the First Committee, 74 draft resolutions were submitted; two years ago, 64 draft resolutions were submitted; and last year, a total of 54 draft resolutions and decisions were submitted by Member States. During the current session, a total of 43 draft resolutions and decisions were submitted. Of this total, one draft resolution and one draft decision were not pressed to a vote, and 22 were adopted by the Committee without a vote - a figure which represents almost 59 per cent of the total number of draft resolutions adopted.

I should also like to take this opportunity to note that the Committee has once again entrusted the Department for Disarmament Affairs with a number of significant tasks and responsibilities. This reflects the continued confidence which the membership places in the Department and the secretariat. In this context, I wish to express my thanks to the secretariat for the efficiency with which it has expedited the work of the First Committee at this forty-sixth session.

The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasushi Akashi; the Secretary of the First Committee, Mr. Sohrab Kheradi; and his assistants, Mr. Mohammad Sattar, Mr. Kuo Chung Lin, Mr. Tsutomu Ishiguri, Ms. Angela Patil and Mr. David Biggs, along with the entire staff of the secretariat and other Committee officers, have made an important contribution to the smooth manner in which our work has been conducted.

(The Chairman)

I wish to express my sincere gratitude also to the two Vice-Chairmen, Ambassador Ordonez of the Philippines and Mr. Alpman of Turkey as well as the Rapporteur, Mr. Sader of Uruguay, for their assistance and cooperation.

It is my understanding that a number of ambassadors and representatives who are stationed in Geneva or their various capitals will be returning to their posts after today's meeting. I wish to thank them for their contribution to the work of the First Committee during the forty-sixth session. As for those of us who will remain to discuss the next items on our agenda, I trust that the next stage of our programme of work will proceed as productively as this one has.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind members that, in accordance with the Committee's proposed programme of work and timetable, as reflected in document A/C.1/46/5 of 8 October 1991, the Committee will begin its general debate, consideration of and action on draft resolutions dealing with item 66, "Question of Antarctica", on Monday, 18 November 1991. I would therefore urge delegations to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible in order to enable the Committee to utilize fully the conference facilities available to it.

I should also like to remind delegations that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on agenda item 66 is Monday, 18 November 1991, at 12 noon.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.